

Request for Proposals # 09-25-001
Environmental Consultant Services for DHCD
Questions & Responses #1
May 8, 2009

This list of Questions and Responses is being issued to clarify certain information contained in the above named RFP. The statements and interpretations of contract requirements, which are stated in the following questions of potential offerors, are not binding on the State, unless the State expressly amends the RFP through an addendum. Nothing in the State's responses to these questions is to be construed as agreement to or acceptance by the State of any statement or interpretation on the part of the potential offeror asking the question as to what the contract does or does not require.

Questions and Responses

Question:

In Section 2.1, Overview, it indicates 10-15 properties in Baltimore Metro areas and Eastern Shore. A) Typically, what is the split between the two geographic areas? B) Is there any potential that the number of assisted properties would significantly increase during the term of the contract? C) Would any of the projects involve properties occupied by children / persons at risk with elevated blood lead levels?

Response:

- A) 50 / 50
- B) Not significantly
- C) Yes.

Question:

In Section 2.2, Scope of Services:

B(1)(d), Risk Assessments, Screen Risk Assessments, Soil Samples, The EPA protocol now does not require soil samples for a screen risk assessment. For this RFP, will it still be a requirement?

Response:

No.

Question:

In Section 2.2, Scope of Services:

B(2)(c), Risk Assessments, Dust Samples, Calls for four samples. The number seems to be low by industry standards of six to eight. Is four to be a considered the minimum or total?

Response:

Four composite samples are minimum. If not composite samples, at least 6-8 single surface dust samples are necessary.

Question:

In Section 2.2, Scope of Services:

B(2)(g), Risk Assessments, Testing of personal property, Generally this is not considered part of a risk assessment, with the possible exception of a property dealing with a child / person at risk with an elevated blood level (which falls under a different testing protocol not specifically referenced in EPA regulations).

Response:

Only if required.

Question:

In Section 2.2, Scope of Services:

C(2) Clearance Examinations – Soil Samples, EPA work practice standards (40 CFR 745.227(E)(8)(v)(C) does not explicitly call for additional soil samples, but cleaning up paint chips if visually noted during the clearance. HUD interpretive guidance on the 24 CFR 35 Part 35 regulations (June 21, 2004 revision) covered by this RFP addresses the issue in questions R10 and R11, and specifically states that soil sampling is not required. In light of this, will soil samples still be required: As an aside, from our experience, the potential of post abatement soil sampling is used more as a deterrent for contractors to encourage them to take appropriate precautions to prevent further soil contamination.

Response:

No clearance on soil samples, just visual inspection.

Question:

In Section 2.3, Insurance Requirements:

A(3) Worker's Compensation, In our case we are all principals and are not required to have this issuance. Will it be a requirement for this RFP?

Response:

We are checking with staff and will provide an answer soon.

Question:

In Section 2.4, Schedule:

Specifies reports to be issued within defined periods of time from the date of inspection. This could be problematic, since most contractors rely on third party laboratories for analysis and thus have little control over when results are received. As an aside, Maryland Department of the Environment regulations base submittal of their paperwork on the date of receipt of laboratory results. Would it be possible to take receipt of results into consideration in this section?

Response:

Yes.

Question:

In Attachment B, Cost Proposal:

In certain cases (i.e. screen risk assessment with fixed sampling protocol), environmental sampling / laboratory costs could be included in quoted rate. In other cases, (risk assessment and clearance) the sampling / laboratory costs are variable. Should laboratory work be considered a separate billable for each of the category of inspection services?

Response:

Yes.

Question:

In Attachment B, Cost Proposal:

Since the physical layout of each dwelling is unknown, we have found it to be more cost effective approach to provide pricing for paint inspections that includes a base rate for a minimum number of room equivalents (typically twelve (12) that tends to cover most average residential dwellings) and a per room addition in the event of larger structures.

Would DHCD entertain this type of pricing structure?

Response:

Yes.

Question:

In Attachment B, Cost Proposal:

In certain cases, sampling of the potably water supply is suggested by the risk assessment protocol. Should it be assumed that if necessary that this would be performed by an other entity such as the local health department or the responsibility of the inspection contractor?

Response:

Yes.